

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

**CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL**

<b>Case No.</b>	CV 17-2404 PA (FFMx)	<b>Date</b>	April 11, 2017
<b>Title</b>	ConsumerTrack, Inc. v. Advertising Direct, LLC		

---

<b>Present: The Honorable</b>	PERCY ANDERSON, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
-------------------------------	--

---

V.R. Vallery

Not Reported

N/A

Deputy Clerk

Court Reporter

Tape No.

Attorneys Present for Plaintiffs:

Attorneys Present for Defendants:

None

None

**Proceedings:** IN CHAMBERS - COURT ORDER

The Court is in receipt of the Complaint filed by plaintiff ConsumerTrack, Inc. ("Plaintiff") against defendant Advertising Direct, LLC ("Defendant").

Federal courts have subject matter jurisdiction only over matters authorized by the Constitution and Congress. Bender v. Williamsport Area School Dist., 475 U.S. 534, 541, 106 S. Ct. 1326, 1331, 89 L. Ed. 2d 501 (1986). In seeking to invoke this Court's jurisdiction, Plaintiff bears the burden of proving that jurisdiction exists. Scott v. Breeland, 792 F.2d 925, 927 (9th Cir. 1986). The Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a) requires that "[a] pleading that states a claim for relief must contain . . . a short and plain statement of the grounds for the court's jurisdiction . . . ." Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a)(1). This District's Local Rules further provide that "[t]he statutory or other basis for the exercise of jurisdiction by this Court shall be plainly stated in . . . any document invoking this Court's jurisdiction." Local Civil Rule 8-1.

To establish citizenship for diversity purposes, a natural person must be a citizen of the United States and be domiciled in a particular state. Kantor v. Wellesley Galleries, Ltd., 704 F.2d 1088, 1090 (9th Cir. 1983). Persons are domiciled in the places they reside with the intent to remain or to which they intend to return. See Kanter v. Warner-Lambert Co., 265 F.3d 853, 857 (9th Cir. 2001). "A person residing in a given state is not necessarily domiciled there, and thus is not necessarily a citizen of that state." Id. A corporation is a citizen of both its state of incorporation and the state in which it has its principal place of business. 28 U.S.C. § 1332(c)(1); see also New Alaska Dev. Corp. v. Guetschow, 869 F.2d 1298, 1300-01 (9th Cir. 1989). Finally, the citizenship of a partnership or other unincorporated entity is the citizenship of its members. See Johnson v. Columbia Props. Anchorage, LP, 437 F.3d 894, 899 (9th Cir. 2006) ("[L]ike a partnership, an LLC is a citizen of every state of which its owners/members are citizens."); Marseilles Hydro Power, LLC v. Marseilles Land & Water Co., 299 F.3d 643, 652 (7th Cir. 2002) ("the relevant citizenship [of an LLC] for diversity purposes is that of the members, not of the company"); Handelsman v. Bedford Village Assocs., Ltd. P'ship, 213 F.3d 48, 51-52 (2d Cir. 2000) ("a limited liability company has the citizenship of its membership"); Cosgrove v. Bartolotta, 150 F.3d 729, 731 (7th Cir. 1998); TPS Utilicom Servs., Inc. v. AT & T Corp., 223 F. Supp.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

**CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL**

Case No.	CV 17-2404 PA (FFMx)	Date	April 11, 2017
Title	ConsumerTrack, Inc. v. Advertising Direct, LLC		

2d 1089, 1101 (C.D. Cal. 2002) (“A limited liability company . . . is treated like a partnership for the purpose of establishing citizenship under diversity jurisdiction.”).

Plaintiff’s Complaint alleges that Plaintiff “is a California corporation with its principal place of business in California.” (Compl. ¶ 7.) The Complaint alleges that Defendant “is a Florida limited liability company with its principal place of business in California.” (Compl. ¶ 8.) The Complaint does not allege the citizenship of each of Defendant’s members, and instead alleges its citizenship as if it were a corporation rather than a limited liability company. Plaintiff has therefore not properly alleged the citizenship of Defendant. “Absent unusual circumstances, a party seeking to invoke diversity jurisdiction should be able to allege affirmatively the actual citizenship of the relevant parties.” Kanter, 265 F.3d at 857. As a result, Plaintiff’s allegations are not sufficient to invoke this Court’s diversity jurisdiction.

Plaintiff’s Complaint also alleges that the Court possesses federal question jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 and 28 U.S.C. § 2201. Because the Complaint states causes of action under state law only, federal question jurisdiction does not exist under 28 U.S.C. § 1331. Plaintiff’s prayer for declaratory relief pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2201(a) does not create jurisdiction over this action. See City of Colton v. Am. Promotional Events, Inc.-West, 614 F.3d 998, 1006 (9th Cir. 2010) (“It is well settled that the Declaratory Judgment Act does not itself confer federal subject matter jurisdiction but merely provides an additional remedy in cases where jurisdiction is otherwise established.”).

Accordingly, the Court dismisses Plaintiff’s Complaint for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. A district court may, and should, grant leave to amend when it appears that subject matter jurisdiction may exist, even though the complaint inadequately alleges jurisdiction. See 28 U.S.C. § 1653; Trentacosta v. Frontier Pacific Aircraft Industries, Inc., 813 F.2d 1553, 1555 (9th Cir. 1987). Therefore, the Court grants Plaintiff leave to amend the Complaint to establish federal subject matter jurisdiction. Plaintiff’s First Amended Complaint, if any, is to be filed by April 24, 2017. The failure to file a First Amended Complaint by that date or to adequately allege the Court’s jurisdiction may result in the dismissal of this action without prejudice.

IT IS SO ORDERED.